



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,927	06/30/2006	Niranjan Kumar Mitra	003D.0067.U1(US)	8408
29683 7590 03/26/2007 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER GUSHI, ROSS N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/26/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/539,927	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MITRA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ross N. Gushi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                               | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Attorney's Certificate</u>            |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

The present Office practice is to insist that each claim must be the object of a sentence starting with "I (or we) claim," "The invention claimed is" (or the equivalent). See MPEP section 608.01(m). Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the limitation of "metal sheet formed" housing parts is indefinite. It is not clear what the limitation means or requires. For the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the limitation means that the housing part is stamped or drawn using sheet metal (as opposed to cast or milled).

Regarding claims 7, "said connecting means" lacks antecedent basis and is confusing and unclear. Regarding claim 8, "said reception means" lacks antecedent basis and is confusing and unclear. The limitations of claims 7, 8, 9, and 11 are given little weight.

Regarding claim 21, it is unclear whether applicant is claiming only the metal sheet housing part or the metal sheet part and the die cast part. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed only the metal sheet part is claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in —

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a);

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al. ("Kramer") in view of Davis et al. ("Davis"). Kramer discloses a cable connector comprising a housing having a (implicit) die-cast base (one shell 25) substantially extending between a front side and a rear side of said connector including a die-cast first housing part (second shell 25) mounted to said die-cast base such that said die-cast first housing part and a first portion of said die-cast base determine a first cable connector portion at said rear side; a metal sheet formed second

Art Unit: 2833

housing part 8 mounted to said die-cast base such that said metal sheet formed second housing part and a second portion of said die-cast base determine a second cable connector portion at said front side. To the extent that Kramer does not state specifically that the shells 25 are die cast and the shield 8 is "metal sheet formed," Kramer states that typically the shell members are stamped and formed or cast metal (Col. 1, line 19). Davis discloses a connector with a drawn (metal sheet formed) shell 28 and a die case housing 26. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to cast the Kramer outer shielding shell 25 and draw/stamp ("metal sheet form") the Kramer thin shield member 8. The method of making the Kramer parts is implicit given how the connector is shown in the drawings. Furthermore, the suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to simplify manufacturing of the parts, as is taught implicitly in Davis (and as is well known in the art), which teaches drawing the thin sheet parts and casting the thick complex parts which cannot be formed by drawing sheet metal.

Per claim 2, said die-cast first housing part is a modular first housing part and said first cable connector portion comprises a ferrule holder portion (i.e. a portion capable of holding a ferrule).

Per claim 4 said metal sheet formed second housing part is a modular second housing part and said second portion of said die-cast base comprises a receiving structure for said second housing part.

Regarding claim 5, to the extent that particular dimensions are not stated in the prior art, at the time of the invention, workable dimensions of the connector (including wall

Art Unit: 2833

thicknesses) would have been a matter of routine experimentation. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618 (CCPA 1977). Variations in the distance would have been obvious minor adjustments without patentable significance. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955)(Where general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation).

Per claim 6, said second cable connector portion comprises an opening (defined by shield 8) at said front side and connecting means (10, 16, 14) located within said second cable connector portion with respect to at least one edge determining said opening.

Per claims 7, said second portion of said die cast base comprises a wire management portion (56) and a connecting means portion with reception means (32).

Per claims 8, the connecting means including blocks 16 and protrusions 14.

Per claim 12 said die-cast base comprises one or more ridges (see attachment).

Per claim 13 said ridges are located in at least a part of said second portion of said die-cast base extending in an axial direction of said cable connector.

Per claim 14 said part of said second portion of said die-cast base is a wire management portion.

Per claim 16, said metal sheet formed second housing part comprises one or more protrusions (10) for mounting said metal sheet formed second housing part to said die-cast first housing part.



Art Unit: 2833

Claims 21-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Woensel et al. ("Van Woensel"). Per claims 21-24, Van Woensel discloses a metal sheet housing part as claimed (see attachment).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 3, 9, 10, 11, 17, and 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art does not suggest the device as claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements, the combination including (c.3) a shaft outwardly protruding from said first cable connector portion, (c.9) one or more wafers associated with said connecting blocks, said wafers comprising holes to cooperate with said protrusions and/or said reception means, (c.10) one or more wafers, said wafers comprising a plurality of signal tracks and/or ground tracks for termination of cable wires, (c.15) one or more protrusions extending from said ridge in a direction substantially perpendicular to said axial direction, (c.17) said metal sheet formed second housing part comprises spring contacts adapted to be received by said first portion of said die-cast base.

Regarding claim 18, the prior art does not suggest the method as claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements and steps, the combination including the cable having a cable ferrule.

***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2833

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2005. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at 571-272-2800 extension 33. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ROSS GUSHI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER